



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,384	02/21/2007	Wonrack Choi	930086-2026	9008
7590 10/07/2008				
Ronald R Santucci				
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG				
745 Fifth Avenue				
New York, NY 10151				
EXAMINER				
HUI, SAN MING R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/575,384

**Applicant(s)**

CHOI ET AL.

**Examiner**

San-ming Hui

**Art Unit**

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/86)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/21/2007
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendments filed April 10, 2006 have been entered. Claims 1-5 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating mild cognitive impairment and dementia, does not reasonably provide enablement for the prevention of mild cognitive impairment and dementia. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

*Ex parte Forman* (230 USPQ 546, BdPatApp & Int.) and *In re Wands* (858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404, Fed. Cir. 1988) provide several factors in determining whether the specification of an application allows the skilled artisan to practice the invention without undue experimentation. Having said factors in mind, the instant specification fails to reasonably provide enablement for methods of preventing the claimed condition. Specifically, the recitation of "preventing mild cognition impairment and dementia" in the instant claims 3 and 4, direct the claims to methods of preventing a pathological condition. However, the specification fails to properly enable such methods.

In the instant case, the burden of enabling for preventing mild cognitive impairment or dementia formation manifestations requires appropriate screening testing, subsequent data compilation, and finally appropriate data analysis, to assess and properly enable one skill in the art whether mild cognitive impairment or dementia are prevented from formation in a patient. For example, the specification must provide adequate guidance whether wrinkles can be prevented from forming in a patient or in this case, any subject, once the composition is administered to a subject susceptible to develop mild cognitive impairment or dementia.

Moreover, the specification must provide direct evidence associating the claimed prevention to the composition applied. The burden of showing preventative properties is greater than that of enabling a treatment, because one of ordinary skill in the art must not only show competent screening of those subjects susceptible to such conditions, but also show that the efficacy of a preventative method is directly caused by applying or administering the instantly claimed composition to the susceptible subjects.

In this case, there is no teaching for screening methods identifying susceptible subjects nor is there any direct evidence of efficacy establishing a preventative property associated with the claimed composition. Furthermore, the state of the prior art concerning methods of preventing mild cognitive impairment or dementia formation is not well described, nor does it provide for any absolute prevention. Accordingly, undue experimentation is necessary to determine screening and testing protocols to demonstrate the efficacy of the presently claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 1 250 852 ('852).

'852 teaches a composition comprising ursolic acid can be isolated from apple skin (See [0001]). Therefore, apple contains ursolic acid, which is encompassed by the claims as one of the herein claimed triterpene compounds.

The herein claimed intended use does not lend any patentable weight to claims that are directed to composition. Apple is considered as food item. Therefore, all of the claim limitations are met.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,948,460 ('460).

'460 teaches ursolic acid used in food as an emulsifying agent (see the abstract, col. 2, lines 38-40 and claim 1).

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (571) 272-0626. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

San-ming Hui  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1617

/San-ming Hui/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1617